## On Case

### North American Integration

#### They say that the plan will cause a huge protectionist backlash, but we have a card that says that it won’t

#### No risk of labor backlash – they like the plan

Kay 3, PhD candidate at UC Berkeley [Tamara, “Even Labor Unions Can Benefit From Free Trade,” 12-23-03, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/even-labor-unions-can-gain-free-trade, CMR]

While NAFTA did not generate relationships among all North American unions, its effects on many unions were profound. Even the AFL-CIO - dubbed the AFL-CIA by progressive Mexican unionists during the Cold War - began to work with independent Mexican unions when its Mexican counterpart, the Congress of Mexican Workers, refused to oppose NAFTA. As one AFL-CIO official explained, "De facto in this process, solidarity links have been built and strengthened. And there's no question that due to this struggle over NAFTA, we have more working relations with the Mexican labor movement and with the Canadians with regard to Mexico than ever before." NAFTA also marked a turning point for how many US unions dealt with the issue of foreign workers and job flight. While NAFTA's introduction led a bevy of anti-free trade pundits to suggest that foreign workers were "stealing" American jobs, the AFL-CIO and leaders of most US unions did not join the melee. Matt Witt, Teamsters Communications Director during the fight against NAFTA offered one explanation: "The increased communication and contact with union activists from Mexico meant that whatever instinct people might have had to go in that direction ran up against the real coalition work people were doing based on the traditional union principle that you either raise and maintain standards together or you face a race to the bottom." Canadian labor leaders also actively eschewed racialized and divisive rhetoric during the free trade debates. In a 1990 letter to Shirley Carr, then President of the Canadian Labour Congress, Robert White (President of the Canadian Auto Workers, who later succeeded Carr at the CLC) wrote to suggest how the CLC should publicly frame issues related to the free trade agreement: "We have to not just avoid, but counter any racist tendencies. The enemy is not Mexican workers. It is corporations trying to escape obligations, and governments trying to guarantee these corporations "favourable" environment by attacking trade union, human and political rights." The emergence of trinational relationships in North America suggests that global governance institutions such as NAFTA can stimulate labor transnationalism by providing new political arenas and venues to advance labor interests. The implication is not that labor activists should embrace neoliberal free trade agreements. Indeed, NAFTA had significant negative effects on workers. Rather, activists should remain pro-actively engaged in the process of shaping and strengthening those agreements to ensure that they provide more political opportunities and democratic institutions, not fewer. Other scholars have shown that few social movements are as well-positioned to serve as ballast against the vagaries of an ever-expanding global economy as a transnational labor movement, with its established membership, political clout, and financial resources. If labor unions refuse to engage global governance institutions such as the NAALC, the FTAA, and the WTO, their ability not only to protect workers' rights, but also to serve as a mechanism to build labor transnationalism, will be compromised.

#### They say that Obama would bash NAFTA because there would be a protectionist backlash, but extend the Kay evidence that we just read -

#### They don’t address any other part of our North American Integration, therefore I extend Clarkson and Mildenberger, Pastor, and Brooks Ikenberry and Wohlforth – Without North American Integration and tri-national cooperation, the United States will lose their global economy stance and power. With United States hegemony loss, they will have to reduce spending in major sectors such as the United States military, which has been the largest peacekeeping force that the world has ever known. If the United States takes out their peacekeeping forces from unstable areas, then conflicts will rise in these unstable areas and escalate as more forces are pulled in leading to an inevitable nuclear war. Therefore our plan solves for North American Integration, which prevents a Global Power War from happening.

### Energy

#### They say that Mexico’s oil company is stagnating and declining, but that is what our investment fund solves for, extend Manley 5 – The reason that Mexico’s oil companies are stagnating is because Mexico doesn’t have the technologies and money to extract their oil reserves. Our North American investment fund would solve for these problems and Mexico would be able to extract oil which will decrease dependence of oil from hostile and unstable countries

#### In their Domm card, they say that the US would become self sufficient in the near future, but specifically in their card, “the US could become nearly self sufficient by 2035”. I don’t know who they are trying to fool here, but 20 years is a long time compared to the time that we can extract oil from Mexico

#### They say that North American Energy Independence causes oversea oil market collapse, but extend Glaser 11 – Disputes over oil in the Middle East clearly implies that other countries are becoming more dependent on oil and looking for more oil as well, therefore there will be no Energy collapse

#### Extend Glaser 11 Strait of Hormuz – If we continue to depend on the Middle East to supply oil for us, any conflict against the supply for oil would escalate and will result in global war.

#### Extend Gjelten 12 – With dependence, the unstable and hostile Middle East has leverage over the United States as they control the crucial

#### Also, our energy investment doesn’t focus specifically on oil, we also focus on clean and renewable energy sources –

#### Current mechanisms exist to invest, especially in Mexico; investment necessary to make energy grid cleaner and more efficient

**PASCUAL 2013** (CARLOS SPECIAL ENVOY AND COORDINATOR FOR INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AFFAIRS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN, HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION APRIL 11, 2013 http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/ or http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/)

The Power Sector¶ This global revolution in gas markets is also leading to a transformation in the power sector. How the world generates and uses energy, especially electricity, is changing quickly. The availability of natural gas has led to innovations in the power sector, resulting in cleaner, more efficient generation and a reduction in green-house gas emissions. Looking forward, it has the potential to be the foundation of the U.S. power sector, both as a cleaner thermal fuel and as a fuel that can complement intermittent renewable technologies. How this is managed will have massive global implications for carbon dioxide emissions and climate change.¶ But let us look practically and pragmatically at the near term, and what this power sector transformation could mean for our industries in natural gas, renewable¶ energy, and transmission and distribution infrastructure. The size of the power market is enormous: the IEA estimates that the power sector in the Western Hemisphere, excluding the United States, will need US$ 1.4 trillion in investment by 2035 to keep up with demand. It is in the interest of the United States to play a part in this market, and take advantage of this development to grow our own economy. A number of U.S. companies are already active in these markets: for example, U.S.-based AES has operations in the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Panama, where it operates 3.5 GW of installed capacity. The Ex-Im Bank has recently helped create 200 jobs in six states, when it approved a $28.6 million direct loan to a Honduran power company, which will purchase high-tech U.S. wind turbines for the Cerro de Hula wind farm in Santa Ana, Honduras.¶ One Initiative provides an example where benefits for U.S. commercial interests, U.S. and regional energy security, and greater regional growth and stability can all be achieved. The “Connecting the Americas 2022” Initiative (Connect 2022), unveiled by President Obama and Colombian President Santos at the Sixth Summit of the Americas one year ago, is a hemispheric Initiative that works to assist countries to achieve their renewable energy goals and promotes regional interconnection of power markets, from Canada to Chile. The United States already has extensive interconnections with Canada; last year our countries traded over 62 billion kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity. Mexico and the United States trade much less, with 11 interconnections and about 1.5 billion kWh of trade in 2011. We continue to build on these opportunities, as do our businesses. For example, Sempra Energy, a San Diego-based energy company, has plans to build a wind farm in a region of world-class wind resources in Baja California, using U.S. wind technology components, and exporting the power back across the border to serve the San Diego market.¶ Interconnection can bring different kinds of benefits to different regions. For example, in Central America, markets are very small -- all together they account for less electricity demand than the state of South Carolina -- which makes it difficult to attract large-scale investment. They have a strong dependence on heavy fuel oil for electricity production, which is dirty, expensive, and almost entirely imported. The cost of this energy dependence is large, and links their economies to volatile oil prices, undermining their ability to grow and develop economically. Interconnection within Central America, and also with Colombia and Mexico, would promote greater energy security through the creation of more competitive, standardized, resilient, and larger markets. It is also an important step toward regional integration and prosperity.¶ Connect 2022 is also working in the Andes region, where the markets are larger but experience severe weather effects. Colombia derives approximately 70 percent of its electricity from hydropower, and most years it has excess capacity. But it is also hypersensitive to the El Niño effect, which causes droughts every two-to- seven years, requiring them to maintain a large number of inefficient thermal plants to cover shortages. Ecuador and Peru also have hydropower resources, but experience their El Niño effects during different months than Colombia, such that “wheeling” power north and south between these countries will allow their systems to complement one another during shortages. Interconnection among these countries would enable a more efficient use of existing resources, eliminating the need to build redundant large-scale dams, which increasingly raise concerns for environmental and indigenous rights groups. Governments in the region with large hydro-dependence are already exploring additional ways to provide their population centers with affordable power, such as through solar, wind, geothermal technologies, as well as natural gas and smaller-scale run-of-river hydro projects. In order to take advantage of those resources, countries must develop their power sector infrastructure, including smartgrid technologies. All of this spells tremendous commercial and development opportunities, and companies around the world are taking notice.

### Illegal Immigration

#### All they say about immigration is that Illegal Immigration is declining, but it is not. Extend our Dinan card, which clearly says that Illegal Immigration is increasing due to statistics on arrest rates made by border patrol.

#### Extend Ting, Joyner, and Ayson – with the on coming tide of illegal immigrants making their way into the United States, it Is easy for a terrorist organization against the United States to sneak their way into the United States, build a dirty bomb with materials that are smuggled, and set it off leading to a massive nuclear war as there is a large chain of retaliation. The United States wouldn’t do nothing about a nuclear bomb, they would retaliate. They did not address this

#### Also Extend FAIR, and Steinburner – With the large number of illegal immigrants coming into the United States, there is high probability that a disease would come into the United States because of the poor health care of Mexico. Also, disease would spread now because of the implication of international travel and trade, and previously in history major pandemics have happened. They also didn’t address this

#### By increasing investment, there will be economic growth, CREATING MORE JOBS, therefore destroying the incentive for illegal immigrants to migrate to the United States. According to Hing 13

### Solvency

#### They say that internal reform is a prerequisite, but extend our pastor 8 evidence – By investing and creating a community, our plan encourages political reform to solve problems which have been stalemated in Mexico

#### They say that only trinational cooperation will solve, but extend pastor 8 – which already says that Canada will follow United States lead. Canada is one of the largest trading partners of the United States, and they have good relations. Also, it is a good way for Canada to get the attention of the United States.

#### They say that the plan won’t secure long term investment, but extend pastor 12 – The North American Investment fund reinvigorates US regional leadership and sustains long-term cooperation with Mexico while promoting successful integration; Instructing a North American Community would strengthen the economies, improve security, and maintain supremacy for all three countries. North America would become a major superpower

## Off Case

### China Counterplan

**Perm: Do both**

**Doesn’t solve the case –**

**a. Integration – Only US lead can facilitate rebuilding North American integration – that’s our Pastor and Smith Evidence – It is a disadvantage to their counterplan**

**b. Energy – US investment is critical to achieve first-mover access to Mexican oil – the Counterplan means that China would get there first**

**c. Experience - China’s economic similarity to Mexico won’t allow it to provide the proper reforms that are key to implementing change—the US’ engagement is what will provide incentive and experience for Mexico to provide the reforms – that’s Pastor**

#### Chinese investment will fail – bad relations with Mexico

Ellis 5 (June 2005, R. Evan Ellis, professor of national security studies, modeling, gaming, and simulation with the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies at the National Defense University, with a research focus on Latin America’s relationships with external actors, including China, Russia, and Iran. Author of “China in Latin America: The Whats and Wherefores” and more than 20 articles in this research area. Strategic Studies Institute. “U.S. National Security Implications of Chinese Involvement in Latin America” <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=606>)

Chinese trade with Mexico is signiﬁcant and has been expanding at the same rapid rate as with other parts of Latin America. Between 1998 and 2003, Mexican exports to China increased by 337 percent, while corresponding imports from China increased by 476 percent.109 In 2004, bilateral trade between China and Mexico was more than $7 billion, representing a 44 percent increase over 2003.110 By contrast to other Latin American countries, however, Mexico has a trade deﬁcit with China that is signiﬁcant and growing. Mexican imports from China in 2003 were $9,298 million, compared to exports of $463 million.111 Indeed, if the Mexican trade deﬁcit with China was only half of this level, Latin America as a whole would register a positive balance of trade with the Asian giant. A study by BBVA suggests that, by contrast to other nations in Latin America, the structure of Mexican exports resemble that of China.112 Thus while the economies of many other nations in Latin America may be regarded as complimenting those of China, Mexico more of a direct competitor―particularly in labor-intensive, lowvalue added manufacturing sectors. Perhaps reﬂecting the less complimentary nature of the economic relationship between the two countries, Chinese investment in Mexico has been relatively modest relative to other Latin American countries―$200 million in 2004, for example. Despite the current nature of the relationship in the short term, Mexico offers a number of attractions for China, including signiﬁcant quantities of oil and other strategic materials, and a number of commercially developed Paciﬁc ports. On the other hand, Mexico currently uses almost all of the oil that it produces, leaving little available for export. Moreover, Mexico’s proximity to the United States may make China wary of too aggressively pursuing investment there in the near term. Nonetheless, China has indicated interest in pursuing a relationship with Mexico in a number of important arenas, as reﬂected by inclusion of Mexico as the ﬁrst stop in a high-proﬁle ﬁve-nation Latin American and Caribbean tour made by Chinese Vice-President Zeng Quinghong in January-February 2005.113

#### Mexico says no – they see Chinese aid as a threat to their economic future

Hearn 9 (Dr. Adrian H., research fellow at the School of Social and Political Sciences, the University of Sydney. He has conducted research in Cuba (three years) and China (ten months), and is currently undertaking a study of Chinese engagement with Latin America. Author of multiple books on Cuba, China, and Latin America. Pacific Rim Report No. 52, January 2009 “China’s Relations with Mexico and Cuba: A Study of Contrasts” <http://usf.usfca.edu/pac_rim/new/research/pacrimreport/pacrimreport52.html>)

Over the past decade the threats posed to Mexico’s economy by China have become well known, owing primarily to intensifying competition from legal and illicit Chinese imports both domestically and into Mexico’s primary export market, the United States. Chinese demand for energy resources has simultaneously forced the Mexican government to confront the socially unpopular and strategically uncertain prospect of privatizing the oil industry. The economic impasse produced by this combination of pressures has provoked fears of an impending ‘China threat’ across Mexico’s industrial landscape. Mexican apprehensions of an emerging ‘China threat’ find historical precedence in the observations of Vladimir Lenin in the early 20th century, Raúl Prebisch in the 1950s, and Noam Chomsky since the 1980s: that Latin America’s prospects for moving inwards from the periphery of the global market lie in less dependence on resource exports and more in attention to educational and technical advancement. Mexican leaders have been aware of this at least since the 1930s. In 1938, for instance, Lázaro Cárdenas nationalized the oil industry under the PEMEX Corporation with the aim of boosting the state’s budget for social programs, technical training, and industrial upgrading. Successive governments deepened this model of development, gradually moving Mexico toward import substitution and industrialization. The collapse of global commodity markets in the late 1970s and a chronically overvalued peso, however, led to a reconsideration of trade policies and the initiation of measures to privatize the economy.

#### Chinese aid is detrimental to the long-term health of Mexico’s economy

Hearn 9 (Dr. Adrian H., research fellow at the School of Social and Political Sciences, the University of Sydney. He has conducted research in Cuba (three years) and China (ten months), and is currently undertaking a study of Chinese engagement with Latin America. Author of multiple books on Cuba, China, and Latin America. Pacific Rim Report No. 52, January 2009 “China’s Relations with Mexico and Cuba: A Study of Contrasts” http://usf.usfca.edu/pac\_rim/new/research/pacrimreport/pacrimreport52.html)

One negative, though hardly unexpected, consequence of Mexico’s continuing regulatory codes is that suppliers and retailers have found creative ways to circumvent them. According to the 2007 Inquiry into Antidumping Quotas Against Imports of Chinese Origin, undertaken by the Mexican consultant IQOM Trade Intelligence, some Mexican firms have arranged legal loopholes and exceptions to antidumping quotas for their Chinese counterparts (Garc’a 2007). A related problem is the growth of the informal economy, which, as noted above, has seen illegal imports from China claim some 60 percent of the Mexican apparel retail market, drawing attention to local corruption in the customs system as a factor contributing to the trade imbalance. Ultimately some responsibility for China’s negative economic impact on Mexico lies with both countries, but it also lies with the larger global trade regime that encompasses them. While it is true that Mexican regulation of the energy sector is preventing the inflow of FDI, it is also true that free trade will not provide a miracle solution to Mexico’s problems. Conservatives within the Mexican Ministry of Economy argue that open markets in shoes and other products will eventually benefit Mexican consumers by lowering prices, but their critics point out that multinational companies such as Wal-Mart, now Mexico’s largest private-sector employer, will reap most of the profits (Tingting 2003). Most Latin American countries (particularly those in South America) have derived short-term economic gains from natural resource exports to China. Just as they found in dealing with the United States, though, unregulated enclave developments locked up in industrial parks and resource extraction projects not only create dependency on external enterprises, but do little to strengthen local human capacities or to create opportunities for local business (Pritchard and Hearn 2005, also see Angeles 2003). Regional dissatisfaction with this predicament is reflected in a 2006 poll conducted by the Chilean organization Latinobarometro, which calculates that 63 percent of Latin Americans have come to oppose unregulated foreign management and investment in gas, oil, and other mineral extraction initiatives (Economist 2006:42). These lessons should be born in mind as Mexico reflects on the prospect of opening its oil industry to private investment, whether from China, the United States, or elsewhere.

### Politics

#### Won’t pass the House – preference for piecemeal reform, border security, and lack of momentum

Martin 7/10/13 (Gary, “House GOP resists calls for comprehensive immigration reform”, <http://www.chron.com/news/nation-world/article/House-GOP-resists-calls-for-comprehensive-4658690.php>, CMR)

House Republicans expressed a clear preference for a deliberate, patchwork approach to immigration reform Wednesday, telling their leaders they favored border security measures before any consideration of citizenship proposals.¶ "We are very anti-comprehensive - we are all about piecemeal," said Rep. John Fleming, R-La.¶ Most GOP lawmakers apparently were unmoved by pleas from national party leaders including former President George W. Bush to reach a consensus and move forward to tackle the problem.¶ "The only consensus was on border security first," said Rep. Lamar Smith, R-San Antonio.¶ Path to citizenship¶ The hours-long meeting was seen as a key moment in the national immigration debate, and one that appeared to halt momentum on the politically volatile issue.¶ The Senate passed a sweeping immigration reform bill last month on a bipartisan 68-32 vote.¶ That bill would create a 13-year path to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants here illegally and would provide legal permanent status within six months.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, repeated that he would not take up the Senate bill without the support of a majority of Republicans in the House. But he warned the caucus that inaction on the issue could be a strategic mistake.¶ Rep. John Culberson, R-Houston, said citizenship was unlikely to draw the GOP support needed to pass in the House.¶ "It's unnecessary, it's illogical and it's self-destructive. This is a law enforcement issue," Culberson said.¶ "It would be a direct affront to every legal immigrant," Rep. Tom McClintock, R-Calif., said of providing undocumented immigrants citizenship.¶ McClintock's sentiment was shared by many members who oppose citizenship as an amnesty

to lawbreakers.

**Boehner loves the plan**

**Palmer, 12** (Doug, columnist @ Reuters specializing in trade issues, 5/8, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/05/08/usa-trade-boehner-idUSL1E8G81HM20120508)

The U.S. **Congress' top Republican** on Tuesday **called for deeper U.S economic engagement with Latin America**, but also **expressed concern over Iranian influence in the region** and the "alarming willingness" of some governments to abandon international norms. **"In** both Colombia and **Mexico, and the entire hemisphere, the U.S. must be clear that we will not disengage in the fight for free markets** and free, secure people," U.S. House of Representatives Speaker John **Boehner said** in remarks prepared for delivery at the U.S. State Department. "**We must be clear that we will be there, with our** friends and **partners in the region**, committed to fighting and winning the war for a free, stable, and prosperous hemisphere," **Boehner said, speaking to** the Council of Americas, **an organization representing companies that do business in the region**. **Boehner is due** on Tuesday **to receive an award from the group for his work** last year on **winning** congressional **approval of free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama** and South Korea. The pacts were negotiated during the Republican administration of former President George W. Bush, but President Barack Obama, a Democrat, did not submit the agreements to Congress until late 2011, after negotiating changes to make them more palatable to Democrats and securing a commitment for renewal of a worker retraining program known as trade adjustment assistance. "When the Colombia Free Trade Agreement enters into force (on May 15), it will be an important moment for the prosperity of our hemisphere. It is equally important that the Panama Free Trade Agreement be fully implemented in the months ahead," Boehner said, referring to the Obama administration's ongoing work with Panama to implement that agreement. **Boehner said it was important the United States "keep the momentum going" by negotiating new agreements to open markets to American exports**, and said he was disappointed Obama has not sought legislation known as "Trade Promotion Authority" which would help the White House do that. Meanwhile, **Boehner called Iran's attempt to gain influence in the region a "major threat" to democracy and prosperity.** Iranian President Mahmoud Admadinejad's visit to Venezuela and Cuba "underscored the designs Iran has for expanding its influence in Latin America, and its eagerness to forge bonds with governments in the Western Hemisphere that have demonstrated a lesser interest in freedom and democracy," Boehner said.

#### Turn: Plan key to secure immigration reform

Pastor 10 – prof of IR and co-director of the Center for North American Studies and the Center for Democracy and Election Management at American University in Washington, DC (Robert, “Solving Income Gap is Missing Link to Immigration Reform”, May 6, <http://blog.nafsa.org/2010/05/06/solving-income-gap-is-missing-link-to-immigration-reform/>, CMR)

But there is simply no way to halt the illegal flow of immigrants from Mexico to the United States **until Washington** joins with Ottawa and Mexico City to **construct a North American Investment Fund** to build infrastructure in the south of Mexico and connect it to its northern neighbors. **This is** not only the missing link **of comprehensive immigration reform; it is also the missing link of** the North American Free Trade Agreement (**NAFTA**). **Only with a comprehensive development strategy in North America will we ever see Mexico join the first world and North America become a formidable competitor to China and Europe.**

Therefore according to our Pastor 10 card, our plan solves for their politics disadvantage

Also they said hegemony is key, but in cross ex they said that heg doesn’t solve

### 2AC Renewables DA

#### Short-term nuclear war outweighs – it would collapse the environment much more quickly than warming which is decades away

#### Transition not happening – fossil fuels outpacing renewables

Plumer, 7/10 (Brad, Washington Post, “Bad news: The world’s energy supply isn’t getting any cleaner”, 2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/07/10/bad-news-fossil-fuels-are-more-than-keeping-up-with-clean-energy/)

We’ve seen plenty of charts over the past few years showing that wind and solar power are growing at astronomical rates — not just in the United States, but around the world. That seems like an encouraging sign for efforts to tackle global warming. But here’s a sobering counterpoint. Roger Pielke, Jr., an environmental studies professor at the University of Colorado, has charted data on the share of carbon-free energy as a fraction of the world’s overall consumption. When you look at things this way, the share of clean energy around the world has actually stagnated over the past 20 years: It’s true that carbon-free sources like wind and solar and hydropower and geothermal have been growing rapidly. But fossil fuels like oil, coal, and natural gas have also been growing rapidly in the past two decades — particularly in China and India. The result is a stalemate of sorts. The world’s energy supply isn’t any cleaner than it was in the 1990s. (By the way, fans of nuclear will note that the share of carbon-free energy grew most quickly 1965 and 1999 — a period, Pielke notes, when “nuclear power increas[ed] by a factor of 100 and hydropower by a factor of 6.”) Another way to look at the same phenomenon is to measure the “carbon-intensity” of the world’s energy sector — that is, how many tons of carbon dioxide are released into the atmosphere for each unit of energy that’s generated. This takes into account improvements in efficiency and the fact that natural gas is a cleaner fossil fuel than coal. Here, too, there’s been a real stagnation over the past few decades. Check out that gray line: This chart comes from a report this year by the International Energy Agency, which notes that since 1990, the carbon-intensity of the global economy has improved by a mere 1 percent — despite all the concern and all the conferences on climate change. If that trend continues, the IEA says, global carbon-dioxide emissions will keep rising sharply and climate models suggest the Earth could heat up by as much as 6°C (10.8°F) over the long term. That’s what the purple line represents. By the way, the World Bank isn’t sure that humanity will be able to adapt to even 4°C of warming. So 6°C isn’t exactly ideal. Now, alternatively, if the world wants to avoid that balmy fate and keep global warming below 2°C, then carbon intensity will have to improve dramatically — far more dramatically than we’ve seen over the last four decades. That’s what the blue line represents. Is the blue line actually possible? That’s the trillion-dollar question. The full IEA report, “Tracking Clean Energy Progress 2013“ (pdf) has a slew of ideas on how to clean up the world’s energy sector. For instance, global coal use would have to peak before 2020; power plants and factories would have to get a lot more efficient; things like nuclear power and renewables would have to expand at an even faster rate. For now, though, the world’s not on track.

#### Even if funding continues, lack of innovation kills the industry.

Stepp 5-14-2012 (Matthew, Senior Policy Analyst @ Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/boom-and-bust-renewable-energy.php)

But even if much of this funding continues, the nascent clean tech industry is on a potential path of stagnation. In absence of long-term, significantly larger subsidies (which are politically unlikely), government support for clean energy R&D are central to developing and deploying competitive clean tech. In other words, clean tech growth nationwide (and globally) will be determined not by subsidies, but by innovation that can lead to technologies that are better and cheaper than fossil fuels. Yet, our policy choices often don’t reflect this reality. According to ITIF’s Energy Innovation Tracker, the U.S. is investing roughly $6 billion in clean energy R&D in FY2012 – on average a third what leading experts think the U.S. should be investing. In fact, the bulk of the federal government’s historic investment in clean energy – nearly three quarters of the $150 billion – is going to the deployment of existing technologies that are not cost-competitive with fossil fuel sources of energy. While these deployment incentives expand domestic supply chains and are spurring incremental innovations, the policies are acting like blunt force tools propping up lower-risk technologies while playing little role in incenting innovation and technologies to put clean energy on a path to subsidy independence. By not orienting the significant federal investment in clean tech towards spurring innovation while grossly underfunding R&D, the U.S. is failing to jump start and accelerate the clean tech innovations needed to create a robust, long-term sustainable industry. Even if the expiring tax incentives are extended as is, the long-term stagnation of the industry will still occur due to a lack of innovation. If we want a global clean tech revolution driven by the marketplace, we need to bring the equivalent of “Moore’s law” (the prediction that computing power would double every 24 months while costs would fall by half) to clean energy. Nothing less will work.

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

– their impacts are alarmism, not supported by experts

Mauldin 6/4/12 – B.S. and M.S. in electrical engineering from Cal-Berkeley, registered professional engineer (Paul, “Global Warming Alarmism: At the Tipping Point of Credibility?”, <http://smartenergyportal.net/article/global-warming-alarmism-tipping-point-credibility>)

If we believe all we're told then there is no hope. Why change anything? But, to the frustration and anger of the alarmists, we don't believe all we're told about a global warming doomsday. There's a growing belief both in the lay and scientific communities that there's another side to the story. There's mounting evidence that the presuppositions about human-caused climate change are wrong or at the best, distorted. The earth is warming, yes (although that's not all that clear to some), but our planet has gone through warming/cooling cycles in the past. Yes, there is a correlation with CO2 concentrations, but it's not clear which came first, the warming or the change in CO2. And the CO2/temperature-rise pairing cycles have also occurred throughout the past. But isn't the global warming skeptic community pretty much a bunch of ignorant, untrained, flat-earther types? Not at all, according to the study reported in Nature. (see The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks). It turns out that the more scientifically literate you are, the less concerned you are about climate change. Scientific literacy and training leads one to follow their own rationale rather than to follow the herd. "Seeming public apathy over climate change is often attributed to a deficit in comprehension. The public knows too little science, it is claimed, to understand the evidence or avoid being misled. Widespread limits on technical reasoning aggravate the problem by forcing citizens to use unreliable cognitive heuristics to assess risk. We conducted a study to test this account and found no support for it. Members of the public with the highest degrees of science literacy and technical reasoning capacity were not the most concerned about climate change. Rather, they were the ones among whom cultural polarization was greatest. This result suggests that public divisions over climate change stem not from the public’s incomprehension of science but from a distinctive conflict of interest: between the personal interest individuals have in forming beliefs in line with those held by others with whom they share close ties and the collective one they all share in making use of the best available science to promote common welfare." If something just doesn't smell right about the smug but dire predictions frantically pumped out by the media and platoons of alarmist bloggers, you're going to question it. Particularly if you have a fundamental understanding of science and experience with the vagaries of the science/politics/media triumvirate. In the long run, continued climate-change fear mongering, hyperbole and name calling will destroy what little public interest is left. We might even see a 'brown' rebound, and that would be tragic.

#### Renewables not a standalone strategy – intermittency, efficiency is a prerequisite, grid alterations, electricity prices, and European examples aren’t in the context of the US grid.

Rosenthal 3-23 (Elisabeth, “Life After Oil and Gas”, NYTimes, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/24/sunday-review/life-after-oil-and-gas.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)

“There is plenty of room for wind and solar to grow and they are becoming more competitive, but these are still variable resources — the sun doesn’t always shine and the wind doesn’t always blow,” said Alex Klein, the research director of IHS Emerging Energy Research, a consulting firm on renewable energy. “An industrial economy needs a reliable power source, so we think fossil fuel will be an important foundation of our energy mix for the next few decades.” Fatih Birol, chief economist at the 28-nation International Energy Agency, which includes the United States, said that reducing fossil fuel use was crucial to curbing global temperature rise, but added that improving the energy efficiency of homes, vehicles and industry was an easier short-term strategy. He noted that the 19.5 million residents of New York State consume as much energy as the 800 million in sub-Saharan Africa (excluding South Africa) and that, even with President Obama’s automotive fuel standards, European vehicles were on average more than 30 percent more fuel efficient than American ones. He cautioned that a rapid expansion of renewable power would be complicated and costly. Using large amounts of renewable energy often requires modifying national power grids, and renewable energy is still generally more expensive than using fossil fuels. That is particularly true in the United States, where natural gas is plentiful and, therefore, a cheap way to generate electricity (while producing half the carbon dioxide emissions of other fossil fuels, like coal). Promoting wind and solar would mean higher electricity costs for consumers and industry. Indeed, many of the European countries that have led the way in adopting renewables had little fossil fuel of their own, so electricity costs were already high. Others had strong environmental movements that made it politically acceptable to endure higher prices in order to reduce emissions.

#### Renewables fail – intermittency, base-load generation, and storage capacity plus government red tape

Bach 2012 (Nate, J.D. from UCLA School of Law, “The Future of the United States Renewable Sector”, Energy Acuity, http://www.energyacuity.com/blog/bid/219632/The-Future-of-the-United-States-Renewable-Sector)

In any election year, energy use and production has and always will be an important topic of discussion. Governor Romney’s plan involves the intent to start widespread offshore oil drilling in the United States, as well as allowing the wind Production Tax Credit (PTC) to expire. This captures a large focus of Romney’s campaign: renewable energy, specifically wind power, is not an effective, viable, or affordable source of energy. In contrast, the Obama administration has said that it will maintain its steadfast commitment to the development of renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and biofuels. This has drawn the ire of many people, both liberal and conservative, who feel that the costs for developing renewable energy, and the government subsidies provided to developers, are far too high. Romney’s plan also contends that there is uneven playing field for all forms of energy development, citing the tax credits and subsidies granted to renewable, as opposed to conventional energy, as a waste of tax payer money and time. However, while the current cost of installing these systems is high, there are many who attest that this is due to a plethora of policy limitations and setbacks that belabor the process of gaining permission to construct a solar array or wind farm. John Farrell of the Institute for Local Self-Reliance wrote an article comparing the costs and process of installing a 4kw solar array between the United States and Germany . This article shows that, while these costs are indeed high, we do have the power to lower them by creating a streamlined way for renewable projects to apply for and receive permitting. No matter your stance on the renewable sector, there can be no doubt that the development of these energy sources will be at the forefront of this upcoming election, and in some sense the fate of the industry relies heavily on the incumbent resuming his position come January. Many of the detractors of solar and wind power, no matter their political affiliations, focus their complaints on the fact that the production of renewable energy depends entirely on something we cannot control, whether it be the speed of the wind or the limited time the sun spends in our sky. If wind speeds are too high – or too low – the turbine will shut off and no energy will be produced. Turbines are also shut down when too much power is being generated by conventional fuel sources in order to prevent bottlenecking in the electricity grid. For solar power, these limitations are much simpler and obvious: no sun = no power. André Broessel, through the company Rawlemon, has invented a new solar production system, called β.torics, using a glass globe that hopes to address and quash these production problems in the solar field. The sun’s rays would by intensified by passing through the glass and onto a reader, much like a typical concentrated photovoltaic system. However, this device has one aspect that has the potential to change the photovoltaic generation industry forever: the device works at night by harvesting and concentrating the light from the moon in the exact same way it does for the sun. While this device provides an extraordinarily larger amount of energy than a traditional photovoltaic system, it is still subject to weather restrictions, specifically cloud cover or nights when a new moon is in the sky. Despite all of the hindrances, the greatest problem that the renewable sector faces is energy storage. It doesn’t matter how much energy can be produced if there is nowhere to store that energy until it is needed. For example, towards the end of May, Germany, the world leader in installed photovoltaics, set a world record with 22 gigawatt-hours of solar power fed into the grid at the peak of one 24 hour period . The data indicates that this surge in power production met the needs of about half of the country’s power demand for Saturday, May 26. This is a big feather in the cap for the supporters of solar energy, but although this worked in Germany, it does not mean it will work everywhere. The development and subsequent energy production of large scale utility projects in the U.S. are especially subject to grid limitations, adding fodder to renewable energy detractors. If a system designed to provide power to an entire community fails to do so due to grid or weather limitations, the money spent is therefore viewed by many as wasted or inappropriately allocated. However, as the systems or components themselves are being revamped or improved, so too are the storage systems. For example, a German company, Center for Solar Energy and Hydrogen Research Baden-Wȕrttemberg, has developed an innovative and effective way to store electricity generated from renewables. The technology involves converting water into methane gas by using the electricity produced and carbon dioxide and subsequently storing the gas in underground caverns. It stays there until there is a need for electricity that other sources can’t produce, channeling the gas to a firing plant, much in the same way that Landfill Gas is stored and used. While this does require a preexisting area for this gas to be allocated, it shows a clear dedication to not allow the advancement of the renewable energy industry to fall victim to technological limitations. So what do these developments mean for renewables in the United States? While both the β.torics system and the Power-to-Gas technologies are being developed in Europe, their extraordinary functionality is something the whole world should take note of. Certainly, these two devices alone would not be enough to spark a countrywide “green revolution,” especially given the almost inconceivable amount of red tape and policy limitations our government has in place that hinders the development of any renewable energy project. But what this provides is proof that the practical production and distribution of clean energy is possible. These developments will certainly pave the way for many other companies to develop new ways to store energy and new ways to effectively generate it. The industry is constantly growing and changing, and while the technologies may not be developed enough to make any big splashes come November, it is imperative to keep these discussions in mind when addressing the potential of renewable energy and what we, as a country, can do to establish a new road for the renewable sector to grow and provide clean and inexpensive energy to the entire population.